



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IV.—AGAIN LUCILIUS ON *ei* AND *i*.

The rules of Lucilius for the spelling of *ei* and *i* have recently been the subject of considerable discussion, cf. Sommer, *Hermes* XLIV (1909) 70–77; Skutsch, *Glotta* I (1909) 309–311, III (1912) 353 f.; Kent, A. J. P. XXXII (1911) 272–293, *Glotta* IV (1912) 299–302; Ehrlich, *Untersuchungen über die Natur der griechischen Betonung* (1912) 73–77; Fay, A. J. P. XXXIII (1912) 311–316. The last article impels me briefly to take up the subject again.

In considering the date at which earlier *ei* became identical in sound with earlier *i*, it must be granted that inscriptional material between 175 and 150 B. C. is scanty; but in the *Senatusconsultum de Bacchanalibus* of 186 we do find the orthography of *ei* and *i* consistently correct from the historical standpoint. That this inscription preserves final *d* of the ablative, which has been shown to be no longer sounded in the spoken language of Plautus, can hardly impeach its testimony about *ei* and *i*; for the preservation in writing of a lost sound in such a striking position—especially in a definite paradigmatic category—is quite a different matter from the preservation of the graphic distinction of two sounds that have now become identical with each other. The lost sound might remain in memory for some time and appear in writing, like *H = h* upon Attic inscriptions of the last decades before the *h*-less Ionic alphabet was officially adopted at Athens, in 403 B. C.; but the latter distinction could hardly be long preserved unless there was a strong literary orthographic norm. Further, the Plautine quip¹ to the effect that *īram* ‘anger’, i. e. *ēiram*, had been mistaken for a word one letter shorter, namely *eram* ‘mistress’, shows a difference in spelling still appreciated by a general public, or the joke would have passed unnoticed; this is in a play of about 189 B. C. For these reasons, the evidence of the SCdB. on *ei* and *i* is to be considered trustworthy, despite the writing of final *d*; and the knowledge when *ei* should be written and when *i*, is assured at least until 186. No testimony against this can be drawn from the inscription of Spolegium,

¹ Truc. 262 ff.; cf. Anderson, *TAPA*. XXXVII (1906) 85.

CIL. XI 4766, cut before 200 B. C., with the confusion seen in RES DEINA and REIDINAI; for from the root of *dīnus* = *dīvinus* we have *dīnus* with earlier *ī* (= Skt. *divya-h*) as well as *deus divus* with original *ei* (= Skt. *devā-h*); cf. Oscan *dīfviiai*¹ and *dēfvaí* with similar difference of vocalism. A confusion of the two forms of the radical syllable may then be readily understood, especially in a region like Umbria, where diphthongs became monophthongs considerably earlier than in (urban) Latin. How long after 186 B. C. the difference between the sound of *ei* and that of *ī*, or the recollection of the difference, lasted, we cannot determine, except that we find no example of confusion in writing before 150 B. C.

But when the confusion came, Accius² (c. 170 to c. 86) in prescribing orthographic rules adopted the easy device of writing every *ī* with EI; Lucilius (c. 180 to c. 103) on the other hand prescribed EI for *ī* in some words, and I for it in others. The difference between the two men is readily understood: granting graphic EI with the sound *ī* and graphic I with the sounds *ī* and *ĩ*, they differ as the reformers and the conservatives in English spelling to-day. Accius said that I should not have two phonetic values (*ī* and *ĩ*), when EI already had one of these values (*ī*) and was available for use for that sound in all words wherein it occurred, without producing any confusion; such a use left I as the graphic representative of *ĩ* only. Lucilius tried to conserve the practice of earlier years, so far as it was known to him empirically,³ thus upholding a state of affairs as confusing as English *seize, siege, believe, receive, proceed, precede*; that such rules as his should be needed at all, implies either an outrageous confusion in the writing of the time⁴ or the currency of some such rule as that of Accius.

It should be observed, however, that the distinction of the diphthong from the pure vowel was not wholly lost even after 150 B. C.; it persisted in rustic and dialectal Latin, where the diphthong appeared as *ē*—witness rustic *spēca* for urban *spīca*,

¹ Unless this form be an error; cf. Buck, Oscan and Umbrian Grammar, § 95 a and fn., with bibliography.

² Apud Mar. Vict. VI 8, 13-14 K.

³ That he may have consulted older inscriptions is a possibility that can be neither proved nor refuted.

⁴ As is actually found on the inscriptions. Similar confusion reigns in modern Greek, where *εἶναι* means 'est, sunt', but is written *εἶνε*; and *σπίτι* 'house', from Latin *hospitium*, almost invariably appears as *σπητι*.

from original **speicā*.¹ Thus a Roman grammarian could hardly have failed to note that there were words in which urban *ī* corresponded to rustic and dialectal *ī*, and others in which urban *ī* corresponded to rustic and dialectal *ē*; so that words with urban *ī* fell into two distinct classes, separable by their rustic and dialectal equivalents. Lucilius had this to guide him in making up his rules, as well as his own memories of the orthography taught him as a boy.

In these rules, it is of course an *orthographic* distinction of identical sounds, and not a difference in pronunciation, for which he is giving directions. No one could fail to realize that for some time before the composition of the rules *ei* and *ī* had been indistinguishable by *ear*—at least in *urban* Latin. From this follows a corollary, that in the rules every spelling must be adequately indicated in *words*. Now Marx's text of the only passage disputed, is:

- 358 'meille' hominum, duo 'meilia', item huc e utroque opus, 'meiles'
 359 'meilitiam'. tenues i: 'pilam' in qua lusimus, 'pilum'
 360 quo *piso*, tenues. si plura haec feceris pila
 361 quae iacimus, addes e 'peila' ut plenius fiat.

The first part of this Prof. Fay² paraphrases: "Because of its intrinsic plurality *meille*, as well as *meilia*, should be spelt with *ei*. Similarly also the <cognate?> words *meiles* and *meilitia* <?because, as generally used, they are collectives>". But the prescription on the spelling will not be clear without an explanatory comment; and the curious setting of the comment between two sets of examples, as Fay interprets it, should excite surprise. Rather the passage is to be divided with a colon after *item*,³ and with periods after *opus* and after *tenues i*.⁴ Then the rule reads, paraphrased: "*Meille*, and plural *meillia* likewise, both require *e*: *miles* and *militia* have a mere *i*". The traditional punctuation is doubtless an attempt to force upon Lucilius the opinion which Varro LL. V 89 expressed, that *miles* is a derivative of *meille*. An unprejudiced consideration of the Lucilian passage must lead to the conclusion that the examples and the rules applicable

¹ Varro *RR.* I 48, 2; cf. Ehrlich, p. 73 f., for farther evidence of a similar nature.

² *Ib.*, 316.

³ A. J. P. XXXII 275 f.

⁴ *Ib.*, 274.

to them are to be arranged thus—using the text of Marx, unpunctuated, but spelling with *i* throughout:

Examples.	Rules.
I. Mille hominum duo milia	item huc e utroque opus
II. miles militiam	tenues i
III. pilam in qua lusimus pilum quo piso	tenues
IV. si plura haec feceris pila quae iacimus	addes e pila ut plenius fiat

Thus Lucilius prescribes *miles* and *militia*, which are in accord with historical fact (cf. CIL. I 63, I 35); and not *meiles* and *meilitia*.

To understand *pilam* as 'ball', with Fay¹ and others, is impossible, for the verse is then unmetrical: names of letters are long, and *pil(am)* *in* would require a preceding short syllable in the dactylic hexameter. Therefore, *pilam* must be read, and *tēnūēs ī* must be emended to the value of *υ υ —*. While I prefer *tenue i*,² any other reading which has this metrical value—the meaning of the phrase standing here can hardly be matter of dispute—equally well supports my contention.³ I should therefore read *pilam in qua pinsimus*.⁴ Against the usual reading *pilam in qua lusimus* is not only the error in meter, but the peculiar use of *in* in a way not supported by similar phrases and the remarkable perfect tense in *lusimus*, which *is* queer, despite Fay's interpretation⁵ "at which I played <of yore> = no longer play". For that matter, ball-playing was not confined to children among the Romans, and Horace Serm. II 1, 73 f. says that Scipio and Laelius

Nugari cum illo (= Lucilio) et discincti ludere, donec
Decoqueretur holus, soliti,

which has a certain amount of appropriateness here, whatever form the *ludi* of the three friends may have taken.

Prof. Fay thinks⁶ that, at least to Lucilius, *pilum* 'javelin' was the same word as *pilum* 'pestle', and that the *e* of plural *peila* was merely to indicate the number. Had that been Lucilius' thought, it is curious that he should have felt it necessary or desirable to gloss *peila* as 'javelins', when it meant also, and equally well, 'pestles'. This difficulty evidently occurred to

¹ Ib., 314–316. ² A. J. P. XXXII 277–279. ³ Cf. Glotta IV 301.

⁴ A. J. P. XXXII 279 f. *Pila* 'mortar' may very well share in the merry jest tentatively proposed by Fay, A. J. P. XXXIII 314, lines 21–23.

⁵ A. J. P. XXXIII 314.

⁶ Ib., 314 f.

In the verses 367 f. Marx,

if there is some other form with *-ī* from which the datives *furei*, etc., are to be distinguished, that other form may be *Furi*, gen. or voc. sing. to *Furius*, or it may be the third declension abl. in *-ī*. If the former, as Skutsch thinks,³ then Lucilius was right in the lost portion of the rule; if the latter, as Fay thinks,⁴ he was equally right, for the ablative in *-ī* has *īd* borrowed from *i*-stems and used either as an ablative (AIRID CIL. I, 61; SANCTIONI

² Kropatscheck, Jrb. d. arch. Inst. XXIII 79-94, argues that *pilum* 'javelin' is identical with *pilum* 'pestle', and adduces three stages of development: 1, the use of pestles as clubs, evidenced in paintings and in literature; 2, the actual *pila murālia*, with grips closely similar to those of culinary *pila*, but with pointed ends; 3, the normal iron-headed military *pilum*, with the haft of the head showing ornamentation resembling the grip of the pestle. But there is the essential difference that a javelin was intended to pierce, while a pestle could be used only as a club; further, to make his point, Kropatscheck must show that the *pila murālia* preceded in use the iron-headed javelins; and after all, the sporadic use of pestles as clubs can hardly be called a military use of the *pilum* 'pestle' any more than a similar use of the rolling-pin in the humorous columns of the newspapers thereby constitutes that utensil a weapon of war. That *pilum* 'javelin' is but a semantic development of *pilum* 'pestle' seems to me decidedly *not proven*, in the words of the old Scotch verdict, despite Skutsch, Glotta II 379, who declares definitively in favor of Kropatscheck.

³ Glotta I, 310 ftn., where he joined this fragment directly to verses 362 f. Marx, and punctuated thus:

362 porro 'hoc si filius Luci
363 fecerit', i solum, ut 'Corneli Cornificique,
364 mendaci furique'; addes e, cum dare furei
365 iusseris <aut mendacei homini>.

⁴ A. J. P. XXXIII 313.

CIL. I, 198, 56) or as a locative (*lūci*).¹ These conjectures tell directly for Lucilius' correctness.

In the precepts quoted by Marius Victorinus VI 17 f. Keil, that *ei* is to be written in the military *pilum* and *vinea*, in *sica* and *sicilis*,² but *i* in *pilum* 'pestle', *vinea* 'grape-arbor', and *fistula* 'handmill', it is of course impossible to see any truth or accuracy. But so far as Lucilius is concerned, there is nothing to connect these examples, barring *pilum*, with him; Marius Victorinus in this very passage states that more writers have dealt with this vexed question of *ei* and *i* than with any other question of orthography. These precepts seem to come from grammarians of a later date, who lacked all empirical knowledge of the original spellings, and ascribed to all military words, *ei* as in *peilum* 'javelin', and to words of the garden and the bakery, *i* as in *pilum* 'pestle'. So far, one may agree with Fay;³ and had Lucilius prescribed *meiles meilitia*, one could heartily concur in Fay's ingenious interpretation, "*meiles* and *meilitia* and things 'meilitary' with *ei* not *i*"; but I cannot, after repeated careful study, see how the usual punctuation of the Lucilian lines on *mille miles* etc. can be retained.

Lucilius' one error in his rules, the one supposedly certain error, lies in the *ī* of *illī*;⁴ but this has now been shown by Ehrlich⁵ to be the correct orthography. In his valuable monograph, among other matters, he presents the theory that the genitive singular of *o*-stems in Latin is really a locative form ending in original *-ei*; and that original *ei* in unaccented syllables became monophthongal *ī* before the time of the earliest inscriptions, and thus much earlier than *ei* from Indo-European *ai* and *oi* in unaccented syllables developed into *ī*. His careful examination of the material is convincing, and he must be awarded the credit for solving the vexed problem of the genitive ending of *o*-stems. Continuing, by a comparison with Oscan dat. sing. *altrei*, he is assured of IE. *-ei* in the dat. sing. of pro-

¹ Sommer, Handbuch d. lat. Laut- u. Formenlehre, § 225; on the locative of *o*-stems, cf. Ehrlich, p. 71 f.

² So with Fay, A. J. P. XXXIII 316, *sicilem* for Mss. *silicem*, unless the word be in reality an interpolation.

³ Ib.

⁴ In A. J. P. XXXII 283, I explained this "error" as the working of an analogy; but such an excuse for Lucilius is no longer necessary.

⁵ Op. cit., pp. 66-79. My thanks are due to Prof. E. H. Sturtevant of Columbia University, for calling my attention to this passage.

nouns¹—hence **illei*, which became *illi* by the rule just cited, before the earliest inscriptional forms. Lucilius is therefore right in prescribing *illi*; but unluckily no inscriptional instances of *illi* (or of the similar *isti ipsi* etc.) before 150 B. C., have been discovered.

Thus it is on the interpretation of the lines containing *mille miles pila pilum* that our estimate of Lucilius' knowledge or ignorance in the matter depends; for his other precepts are all correct, even that for dat. sing. *illi*. In justice to myself, I desire to add that I was originally led to essay an interpretation of the Lucilian fragments on this topic, not "in the interest of my definition of Lat. *miles* as 'the smiter, smith'", as Prof. Fay thinks,² but in the desire to discover what Lucilius' rules actually meant, and whether they had any value, or none at all. It may be noted that Thurneysen in 1890 was inclined to attribute at least some slight worth to them;³ and now Ehrlich pronounces unhesitatingly in their favor.⁴

After all, we must not forget that when Lucilius prescribes *i* for some words and *ei* for others, he is not theorizing upon the reasons for the difference, but stating (or endeavoring to state) the facts of usage; and however much we may surpass the ancients in our theories of the phenomena of language—and in these theories we are immeasurably ahead of them—we cannot deny that the Romans knew more of the actual facts of their own language than we can presume to know some two thousand years later.⁵

ROLAND G. KENT.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

¹ The *-ei* of *mihei tibeī sibeī* force Ehrlich to regard them as having *-oi*, an ablaut variant to *-ei* in Oscan *s i f e i*, Paelignian *tfei*; but it is easier to suppose that the original forms are **meghei *tebhei *sebhei*, as in Oscan; these became **mihi *tibi *sibi*, and were then remade to *mihei tibeī sibeī* after the final of enclitic **mei *tei *sei*, weakened forms of the enclitic gen.-dat.-loc. **moi *toi *soi* (Greek *μοι τοι οι*—the last with initial *su-*), appearing in old Latin gen. *mī-s tī-s* (Sommer, § 270; **sī-s* does not occur).

² A. J. P. XXXIII 311.

³ KZ. XXX 353.

⁴ P. 73: "Lucilius gründete seine orthographischen Regeln auf gute Tradition"; cf. also p. 73, fn. 2, and pp. 76-77.

⁵ As my friend Professor Charles Knapp of Columbia University justly remarked to me in private conversation not long since.